

1 Charles M. Tebbutt, WSBA #47255
 2 Jonathan Frohnmayer, *pro hac vice*
 3 Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.
 4 941 Lawrence St.
 5 Eugene, OR 97401
 6 Tel: (541) 344-3505
 7 Fax: (541) 344-3516

8
 9 *Additional Counsel Identified on Signature Page*

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

12 COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION FOR
 13 RESTORATION OF THE
 14 ENVIRONMENT, INC., a Washington
 15 Non-Profit Corporation; FRIENDS OF
 16 TOPPENISH CREEK, a Washington Non-
 17 Profit Corporation,

18 *and*

19 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY, INC., a
 20 Washington D.C. Non-Profit Corporation,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 *v.*

23 Case No. 1:19-cv-3110-TOR
 CONSENT DECREE

AUSTIN JACK DECOSTER, an individual,
 DECOSTER ENTERPRISES, LLC, a
 Delaware limited liability company,
 AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT-FUND
 II, a Delaware limited liability company,
 IDAHO AGRI INVESTMENTS, LLC, an
 Idaho limited liability company, IDAHO
 DAIRY HOLDINGS, LLC, and Idaho
 limited liability company, DRY CREEK
 DAIRIES, LLC, an Idaho limited liability
 company, WASHINGTON DAIRY
 HOLDINGS, LLC, a Washington limited
 liability company; WASHINGTON AGRI
 INVESTMENTS, LLC, a Washington

1 limited liability company; DBD
2 WASHINGTON, LLC, a Washington
3 limited liability company; and SMD, LLC, a
4 Washington limited liability company,
Defendants.

5 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs Community Association for Restoration of the
6 Environment, Friends of Toppenish Creek, and Center for Food Safety (collectively
7 “Plaintiffs”) filed a Complaint on May 23, 2019, and a First Amended Complaint on
8 November 8, 2021, in this Court seeking declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as
9 attorney and expert witness fees and costs, against DBD Washington, LLC, SMD,
10 LLC, Washington Dairy Holdings, LLC, Washington Agri Investments, LLC,
11 Austin Jack DeCoster, DeCoster Enterprises, LLC, Agricultural Investment Fund-
12 II, LLC, Idaho Agri Investments, LLC, Idaho Dairy Holdings, LLC, and Dry Creek
13 Dairies, LLC (collectively “Defendants,” “DBD,” or the “Dairies”), alleging
14 violations of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6901 *et seq.*
15 (“RCRA”). Plaintiffs’ Complaint for alleged RCRA violations was brought under
16 the citizen suit provisions of Section 7002 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1)(A) and
17 (B);

18 **WHEREAS**, prior to filing their Complaints, Plaintiffs sent to Defendants
19 Notices of Intent to Sue dated February 11, 2019, April 15, 2019, April 3, 2020, and
20 December 23, 2020, in which they stated their intent to assert claims that Defendants

1 have violated and continue to violate Section 7002(a) of RCRA by contributing to
2 the past and present handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and/or disposal of
3 solid and hazardous waste in such a manner that may present an imminent and
4 substantial endangerment to health and the environment. 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a);
5

6 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs further assert that Defendants employ, and have
7 employed, improper manure management practices that constitute the “open
8 dumping” of solid waste in violation of Section 4005(a) of RCRA. 42 U.S.C. §
9 6945(a);

10 **WHEREAS**, DBD Washington, LLC and SMD, LLC, Washington Agri
11 Investments, LLC, and Washington Dairy Holdings, LLC are registered as limited
12 liability companies in the State of Washington; Dry Creek Dairy, Idaho Dairy
13 Holdings, LLC, and Idaho Agri Investments, LLC, are registered as limited liability
14 companies in the State of Washington; DeCoster Enterprises, LLC and Agricultural
15 Investment Fund-II, LLC are registered Delaware limited liability companies. These
16 Defendants, along with Austin Jack DeCoster, collectively own and operate the
17 dairies known as “DBD Washington,” “SMD,” and the “Heifer Ranch.” DBD
18 Washington is located at or near 5111 Van Belle Road in Outlook, Washington;
19 SMD is located at or near 211 Nichols Road in Outlook, Washington; and the “Heifer
20 Ranch” is located across from SMD on the south side of Outlook Road;
21

22 **WHEREAS**, Defendants deny all claims, including that they violated and

1 continue to violate Section 7002(a) of RCRA by contributing to the past and present
2 handling, storage, treatment, transportation, and/or disposal of solid and hazardous
3 waste in such a manner that may present an imminent and substantial endangerment
4 to health and the environment. 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a).

5 **WHEREAS**, Defendants further deny that they employ, and have employed,
6 improper manure management practices that constitute the “open dumping” of solid
7 waste in violation of Section 4005(a) of RCRA. 42 U.S.C. § 6945(a); Defendants
8 DBD and SMD further allege that they have at all times relevant to this matter held
9 Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation Permits, and that all conduct during the
10 relevant time frames has been subject to oversight, regulation and enforcement of
11 such Permits by the Washington State Department of Ecology.

12 **WHEREAS**, after consultation with their respective counsel, Plaintiffs and
13 Defendants (collectively the “Parties”) hereby wish to settle this lawsuit to avoid the
14 risks of further litigation and appeal and to resolve the controversy between them;
15 and

16 **WHEREAS**, the Parties acknowledge that this Consent Decree has been
17 negotiated by the Parties in good faith and will avoid further litigation, and the Court,
18 in entering this Consent Decree, finds that this Decree is fair, reasonable, and in the
19 public interest.

20 **NOW, THEREFORE**, without the admission of any issue of fact or law

1 except as provided in General Provisions, and upon consideration of the mutual
2 promises contained herein, it is **ADJUDGED, ORDERED, AND DECREED** as
3 follows:

4

GENERAL PROVISIONS

5

6 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the Parties and the subject matter of
7 this lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Venue is proper
8 in this Court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 13912(b). This Court
9 shall have continuing jurisdiction over this lawsuit for the purposes of interpretation,
10 enforcement, and, if necessary, modification of this Consent Decree.

11 2. The undersigned representative for each Party certifies that he/she is
12 fully authorized by the Party whom he/she represents to enter into the terms and
13 conditions of this Consent Decree and to legally bind the Party to it.

14 3. The terms “Dairies’ Facilities” and/or “Dairies” shall refer to the
15 facilities commonly known as DBD, SMD, and the “Heifer Ranch,” as depicted on
16 the maps attached hereto as Exhibit 1¹, and such property that may be acquired as
17 part of Dairy Operations (defined below). These operations are collectively referred
18 to herein as “DBD.”

19 4. The term “Dairy Operations” includes all aspects of the commercial

20

21 ¹ The referenced exhibits are located at ECF No. 180 as attachments and incorporated
22 herein by this reference.

1 production of milk from cows, including but not limited to the related operations of
2 heifer raising, compost, manure management, manure application, manure storage in
3 lagoons and catch basins, the production and storage of silage and other animal feed
4 materials, and the production of agricultural commodities that use manure products
5 from the foregoing aspects of the commercial production of milk from cows.
6

7 5. The Dairy Operations are operated jointly and constitute a large
8 Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) under state and federal law.

9 6. This Consent Decree shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties to
10 this lawsuit and upon all successors and assigns of the Parties until termination. This
11 provision is intended to require compliance with this Consent Decree so long as any
12 portion of the Dairies is used by any person or entity in the course of conducting
13 Dairy Operations or any other CAFO operation or manure processing or treatment
14 facility. However, nothing herein shall prevent Defendants from discontinuing any
15 or all Dairy Operations (whether independently or together) or from transferring any
16 of the Dairies' Facilities to other owners for uses other than for CAFO Operations;
17 this Consent Decree shall no longer apply to real property that is not being used for
18 CAFO Operations or other agriculturally-related operations that involve the treatment
19 and/or storage of manure. DBD, or any of their successors or assigns, may sell the
20 Dairies' Facilities, or any of the real property upon which the Dairies or their
21 operations may currently be conducted, without Plaintiffs' consent and without
22
23

1 approval of the Court; provided, however, that DBD provide a copy of the Consent
2 Decree to the new owner and provide written notice to Plaintiffs of the sale within
3 thirty (30) days of closing.

4 7. This Consent Decree constitutes the final, complete, and exclusive
5 agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the settlement embodied
6 in this Consent Decree and the subject matter of this lawsuit. The Parties hereby
7 acknowledge that there are no representations or understandings relating to the
8 lawsuit or its settlement other than those expressly contained within this Consent
9 Decree. This Consent Decree expressly supersedes, extinguishes, and replaces all
10 prior stipulations and agreements between the Parties.

11 8. This Consent Decree may not be modified in any material respect
12 except by explicit written agreement of the Parties that is approved by the Court.
13 Non-material modifications may be made by the Parties upon written consent.

14 9. This Consent Decree constitutes the full and complete settlement of all
15 claims, rights, demands, and causes of action of any kind, alleged or unalleged,
16 known or unknown, relating to DBD's Dairy Operations, through the date of entry of
17 the Consent Decree, that Plaintiffs asserted or could have asserted against DBD in
18 this lawsuit. Plaintiffs hereby release all such claims and covenant not to sue DBD in
19 connection with them. This covenant not to sue in no way releases DBD from
20 compliance with this Consent Decree or future compliance with other applicable law.

1 Furthermore, this covenant not to sue shall in no way limit Plaintiffs' ability to
2 enforce the terms of this Consent Decree or any future violations of law committed
3 by DBD.

4 10. Each Party acknowledges and represents that it has relied on the legal
5 advice of its attorneys, all listed at the end of the Consent Decree, who are the
6 attorneys of its own choice, and that the terms of this Consent Decree have been
7 completely explained to the Party by its attorney(s), and that the terms are fully
8 understood and voluntarily accepted.

9 11. In the event that any part of this Consent Decree is deemed by a court
10 of competent jurisdiction to be unlawful, void, or for any reason unenforceable, and
11 if that part is severable from the remainder of the Consent Decree without frustrating
12 its essential purpose or imposing an inequitable result on any party, then the
13 remaining parts of the Consent Decree shall remain valid, binding, and enforceable.
14

15 12. If for any reason the Court should decline to approve this Consent
16 Decree in the form presented, then the Parties agree to continue negotiations in good
17 faith in an attempt to cure the objection(s) raised by the Court to entry of this Consent
18 Decree.

19 13. This Consent Decree may be signed in counterparts, and such
20 counterpart signature page shall be given full force and effect.

21 14. The Dairies meet the federal and state law definitions of a large

concentrated animal feeding operation or “CAFO.” 40 CFR § 122.23. In operating the Dairy Facilities, DBD shall abide by this Consent Decree, their combined CAFO permit, Dairy Nutrient Management Plans (“DNMP”), and the Washington Dairy Nutrient Management Act, RCW 90.64, *et seq.* If any of the terms of this Consent Decree are stricter than the aforementioned laws, then the terms of this Consent Decree shall control. If any of these laws are stricter than the terms of the Consent Decree, either now or in the future, such stricter laws shall apply. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Parties agree that nothing in this Consent Decree may be construed to obligate DBD to violate any law or regulation. In the event of any perceived conflict, the Parties agree to submit the matter to the dispute resolution process described in Paragraph 59.

LAGOONS

15. Defendants hereby agree to either double-line or abandon DBD Lagoon Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, SMD Lagoon No. 3, and any new lagoons constructed on the property. DBD agrees that all lined lagoons under this Consent Decree must use a drain liner that meets GRI – GM13 Standard Specification (e.g., AGRU “Drain Liner”) overlain by a 60-mil textured HDPE liner, with incorporated leak detection, as described in Exhibit 2. DBD agrees that lagoons to be abandoned shall strictly comply with the lagoon decommissioning specifications detailed in Paragraph 20.

16. DBD Lagoon No. 5 and SMD Lagoon No. 3 are currently empty with

1 manure liquid and solids removed and will remain empty until lined. DBD shall line
2 DBD Lagoon No. 5 and SMD Lagoon No. 3, with such lining to be completed no
3 later than 6/30/24.

4 17. DBD Lagoon Nos. 1, 2, and 4 are currently utilized for manure storage.
5 DBD Lagoons 1 and 2 will be emptied with solids removed by 8/1/2023. DBD
6 Lagoon 4 will continue to be used until Lagoon 5's lining has been completed and
7 put into service. Lagoon 4 shall be emptied and solids removed no later than
8 9/30/2024. Following the removal of its contents, DBD Lagoons 2 and 4 shall remain
9 empty until lined or abandoned pursuant to Paras. 15, 18 and 19. DBD shall crop
10 DBD Lagoons 1, 2, and 4 with Triticale or Alfalfa, with no nutrient addition, and
11 DBD shall take reasonable measures to timely remove accumulations of rainwater or
12 runoff. DBD Lagoon 1 will be closed no later than December 31, 2025.

13 18. DBD Lagoon No. 3 is currently empty with manure liquid and solids
14 removed and shall remain empty until lined or abandoned. DBD shall crop DBD
15 Lagoon 3 and plant with Triticale or Alfalfa, with no nutrient addition, in 2023. DBD
16 shall take responsible measures to timely remove accumulations of rainwater or
17 runoff. DBD Lagoon 3 shall remain empty until lined or abandoned pursuant to
18 Paragraphs 15, 18 and 19. At DBD's option, Lagoon 3 may be combined with Lagoon
19 2 prior to any lining. All further decisions on lining, including those of Lagoon Nos.
20 2, 3 and 4, shall take into account whether the enzyme or oxygenation treatments, or
21
22
23

1 both, used in the Pilot Projects shall be applied to those specific areas. No enzyme or
2 oxygenation treatment shall be required if: 1) the average composite samples from
3 seven (7) borings in the soils above the water table do not exceed 45 ppm nitrate plus
4 ammonium and ground water downgradient from the lagoon does not exceed 10 ppm
5 nitrate plus ammonia or 1 ppm nitrite; 2) the soils exceeding 45 ppm nitrate plus
6 ammonium are excavated and land applied properly; or 3) if the cropping removes
7 the excess of 45 ppm nitrate plus ammonium. Upon completion of the Remediation
8 Investigation, the Parties shall confer about whether excavation, pump and treat,
9 enzymatic treatment, oxygenation treatment, or some combination thereof, or no
10 further action, are best suited for each area.

13 19. Prior to lining, all liquids and organic solids shall be removed from the
14 lagoons. Following removal of manure liquids and solids from the lagoons all lagoons
15 being cropped will be irrigated with the enzyme technology.

Lagoon Decommissioning

17 20. All Lagoon abandonment projects and closures shall be completed
18 according to all the following terms:

20 a) *Lagoon Closure – Permanent Decommissioning* requirements of
21 Section S4.B.1.f of the January 18, 2017, CAFO General Permit
22 (combined), which is also S4.C.4.E. of the January 6, 2023, permit,
23 issued by the Washington State Department of Ecology, or

1 whatever more stringent protocol may be in place at the time;

2 b) Guidance provided by *NRCS Conservation Practice Standard*

3 360 – *Waste Facility Closure (NRCS, WA September 2018 or other*
4 guidance then in effect);

5 c) Conduct topographic surveys extending to a minimum of 50 feet
6 beyond the edge of each lagoon, or to adjacent roads or lagoons,
7 whichever is closest, and containing the location of existing
8 utilities;

9 d) Removal of all liquids and organic solids from the lagoons;

10 e) Following removal of liquids and solids from the lagoons, DBD
11 shall remove material from floor of the lagoon until undisturbed
12 (“pre-construction”) soils are encountered. The decommissioned
13 lagoons shall be cropped with the purpose of extracting excess soil
14 nutrients while the parties conduct the pilot studies contemplated
15 by Paras.21-23, below;

16 f) All piping infrastructure to and from abandoned lagoons shall
17 be removed or, if not practicable, cut and capped in place.

18 21. All information collected and analyzed pursuant to Paragraph 20 shall

19 be provided to Plaintiffs contemporaneously with receipt by DBD, but in no case
20 more than five (5) business days from receipt by DBD.

Groundwater Pilot Programs

22. The Parties have jointly devised a focused Pilot Program to determine the feasibility and efficacy of their respective visions for potential remediation of the excess nitrate and ammonium contamination of the soil and groundwater beneath the Dairy lagoons, excluding DBD Lagoon 5 and SMD Lagoon 3, each of which shall be double-lined. Plaintiffs envision oxidizing the variable levels of ammonium in the soil profile in order to transform it into nitrate, speeding up leaching it into the aquifer, and then pumping it out as irrigation water. DBD envisions an enzyme/electrokinetic trial that may reduce or eliminate nitrate altogether. Plaintiffs have prepared a Remediation Investigation Plan (RI) that is attached hereto as Exhibit 3. DBD agrees to allow and cooperate with the provisions of the RI, subject to the following limitations: 1) the RI will not begin unless first permitted and authorized by Department of Ecology. The parties shall have one hundred-eighty (180) days from the entry of this Consent Decree to complete the RI; 2) the RI cost for Plaintiffs' work as outlined in the RI, to be paid by Defendants, shall not exceed \$80,000; and 3) the parties shall provide each other all the data, field notes, and analyses collected under the RI within thirty (30) days of receipt of such information, but in no case no later than 9/30/23 (unless delays contemplated by this Decree occur). Defendants shall provide all data collected during investigation or sampling activities at the Dairies.

23. Each Party's Pilot Program shall be conducted during 2023 through

1 2025 with the expectation that the Pilot Programs may be able to be completed by the
2 end of 2024. DBD shall pay for Plaintiffs' implementation of its proposed Pilot
3 Project. Plaintiffs shall undertake no Pilot Program activities, including no activities
4 contemplated under the RI, unless first authorized and permitted by the Department
5 of Ecology. Plaintiffs' representatives may visit their pilot area as often as reasonably
6 necessary, provided that: Plaintiffs shall provide twenty-four (24) hours' notice
7 before visiting their respective pilot area, including the names of the visitors and the
8 approximate hours of visitation. No agents of Plaintiffs shall remain on the Dairy
9 Facility before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m., or on weekends, without the advance
10 written permission from DBD. All costs for Plaintiffs' pilot program, separate from
11 the RI, shall not exceed \$220,000 at DBD or SMD, such sum to be paid by
12 Defendants. The Parties shall exchange the results of their respective Pilot Programs
13 within ninety (90) days of completion, but in no case later than 12/31/2025. DBD
14 shall additionally submit a report no later than such date analyzing the results of its
15 other control, containment, and retrieval methods, including but not limited to its
16 cropping of empty lagoons and its efforts to uptake ammonium through cropping.
17

20 24. After exchanging the results of their respective Pilot Programs, the
21 Parties shall confer in good faith for a period of no more than ninety (90) days, as
22 implementation of possible results of the Pilot Program may lead to earlier
23 remediation of the ongoing contamination, about whether either Pilot Program should

be utilized at the Dairies' Facilities to remediate the nitrate and ammonium contamination of the soils and groundwater underlying the Dairies' lagoon footprints.

If the Parties are unable to agree, then the Parties shall submit their dispute to a neutral arbitrator for resolution. Should the Parties be unable to agree on a willing and available arbitrator within such ninety (90) days, they shall apply to the Court to appoint one. DBD shall pay the fees of the arbitrator. In evaluating the Parties' proposals, the Parties request that the arbitrator base their decision on the scientific results achieved by the respective Pilot Programs, the nitrogen levels still remaining beneath the respective footprints of the lagoons, and the relative costs of the proposed remediation. The mediator shall have discretion to award fees to Plaintiffs if they are the substantially prevailing party on any arbitrated issues. Should the Pilot Programs be delayed for good cause (such as permitting delays), the dates for lagoon lining and reporting may be adjusted by the Parties as minor modifications to this Consent Decree without approval of the Court.

GROUNDWATER MONITORING

19 25. DBD has installed thirteen (13) groundwater monitoring wells at
20 locations generally depicted on the map attached hereto as Exhibit 4. Additional RI
21 wells shall be installed by DBD under Plaintiffs' oversight. DBD shall monitor these
22 wells on the same schedule until the Pilot Project is complete. Plaintiffs shall take a
23 complete round of samples of all wells upon installation of the additional RI wells,

which will count toward one of the quarterly samples noted below. The Dairies shall quarterly sample and analyze the wells within the Monitoring Well Network on the following schedule: June, September, December, and March. Following the first eight quarterly samples, sampling at the Monitoring Well Network shall occur on a semi-annual basis (twice per year; June and December) until four consecutive testing events show the average nitrate concentration in each well, calculated from the prior four sampling events from each well, is below the Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) of 10 ppm nitrate and 1 ppm nitrite. For purposes of the nitrate MCL number, "nitrate" shall include nitrate and ammonia together.

26. The quarterly sampling for the Monitoring Well Network includes solely the parameters identified below:

Laboratory Parameters

- Nitrate (as nitrogen) by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 300.0
- Nitrite (as nitrogen) by EPA Method 300.0
- Chloride by EPA Method 300.0
- Ammonia (as nitrogen) by EPA Method 350.1 or Standard Method 4500-NH₃ G (methods are equivalent)
- Total phosphorus by EPA Method 365.1 or Standard Method 4500-P E (methods are equivalent)

- 1 • Total Kjeldahl nitrogen by EPA Method 351.2 or Standard Method 4500-
- 2 Norg C using colorimetric detection (methods are equivalent)

3 *Field Parameters*

- 4 • pH, dissolved oxygen, groundwater elevation, oxidation reduction
- 5 potential, specific conductivity (using a field meter to determine when
- 6 water is ready to be sampled).

7 27. DBD agrees to provide to Plaintiffs, in electronic form, the laboratory
8 results of each groundwater sampling event within fifteen (15) days of the date DBD
9 receives the results. Results from the Dairies' selected, certified laboratory shall be
10 the official results for determining compliance with the Consent Decree, unless a
11 sampling or laboratory error makes the results inaccurate. In the event that the Dairies
12 choose to use a different laboratory for monitoring well data capture, the Dairies shall
13 so notify Plaintiffs. So long as the Dairies' selected laboratory is certified by the State
14 of Washington Department of Ecology, Plaintiffs shall not unreasonably withhold
15 agreement for DBD to change laboratories.

16 **MANURE APPLICATION AND FIELD MANAGEMENT**

17 28. The provisions of this Section shall apply only to Application Fields
18 owned, leased, or otherwise controlled by Defendants, including any Application
19 Fields Defendants own, lease, or otherwise control after the Effective Date and during
20 the term of this Decree. All such Application Fields owned, leased, or otherwise
21

1 controlled by Defendants shall be addressed in Defendants' DNMP.

2 29. For purposes of this Decree, Defendants shall be deemed to "control" an
3 Application Field to which manure is applied when (a) the manure is applied by
4 Defendants' employees or Defendants' contractors using Defendants' or
5 Defendants' contractor's trucks or application equipment; (b) when the
6 amounts/rates of application are not dictated by the recipient; and (c) when
7 Defendants are not meaningfully compensated for such manure. For purposes of
8 this subparagraph, reimbursement for fuel costs is not considered meaningful
9 compensation.

10 30. With respect to nitrogen, Defendants shall adhere to the following
11 beginning in the Fall of 2023:

12 a. Defendant shall make nitrogen applications at or below
13 agronomic rates based on Application Field-specific nutrient management budgets
14 prepared by an agronomist.

15 b. No later than January 31, 2025, Defendants shall have their
16 agronomist conduct a retroactive review of their agronomic rate calculations and
17 field nutrient performance data for crop years 2022-2024 and document that review
18 in a report ("Agronomic Rate Report"). This review shall assess whether, taken as a
19 whole, the agronomic rate calculations have adequately projected nutrient utilization
20 within the bounds of good agronomic practice with the parallel goal of minimizing
21
22
23

1 leaching potential to groundwater.

2 c. Defendants' agronomist's review of nutrient utilization shall
3 include the mineralization of residual soil nitrogen, the availability of nitrogen from
4 applied manure, the extraction of nitrogen by crops and the status and trends of
5 residual nitrogen in the Application Fields.

6 d. In the event that Defendants' management of manure in crop
7 years 2022-2024 has followed its agronomist's recommendations based on
8 agronomic rate calculations, evidence requiring adjustments to the agronomic rate
9 calculations shall include excessive amounts of residual soil nitrogen (greater than
10 15 ppm) occurring consistently in some application fields or failure to reach 15 ppm
11 in twenty-five percent (25%) or more of Defendants' Application Fields.

12 e. Defendants shall submit to Plaintiffs in accordance with the
13 Notice provisions in Paragraph 62 a draft of the Agronomic Rate Report for
14 Plaintiffs' review and comment no later than April 30, 2025. Defendants shall
15 consider any comments Plaintiffs submit to Defendants on the draft Agronomic Rate
16 Report if Plaintiffs deliver such comments to Defendants in accordance with the
17 Notice provisions in Paragraph 62 no later than forty-five (45) calendar days after
18 Defendants provide Plaintiffs with the draft Agronomic Rate Report. Defendants
19 shall finalize the Agronomic Rate Report no later than July 30, 2025, and send a
20 copy to Plaintiffs upon completion. If the conclusions of the finalized Agronomic
21

1 Rate Report indicate a need to adjust the agronomic rate calculation assumptions,
 2 such conclusions shall be implemented by Defendants beginning with crop year
 3 2026 summer crop and through the termination of this Decree.
 4

5 f. Defendants shall restrict their manure application in the manner
 6 described in the following Table 1:

7 **Table 1. Manure Application Restrictions for Nitrogen Control**

8 Fall Average Residual N in Upper 2 feet 10 (NH 4-N+NO3- N)	9 Nitrogen Application Restrictions Based on Measured Fall Average Residual Soil Nitrogen Levels (NH ₄ -N+NO ₃ -N)				10 Split Application Schedule for Manure Applied by Irrigation (Crop Year 2025+ Only)	
	Crop Year 2024 (Fall 2023)	Crop Year 2025 (Fall 2024)	Crop Year 2026 (Fall 2025)	Crop Year 2027+ (Fall 2026)	Portion of winter crop application made in fall (Oct-T200)	Portion of winter crop application made in spring (After T200)
≤ 15 mg N/kg	100% of agr. rate	100% of agr.	100% of agr.	100% of agr.	≤ 100%	Balance
15.1-25 mg N/kg	100% of agr. rate	100% of agr. rate	95% of agr. rate	90% of agr. rate	≤ 66%	Balance
25.1-35 mg N/kg	95% of agr. rate	85% of agr. rate	80% of agr. rate	75% of agr. rate	≤ 33%	Balance
35.1-45 mg N/kg	90% of agr. rate	80% of agr. rate	70% of agr. rate	60% of agr. rate	0%	Balance
> 45 mg N/kg	No appl.	No appl.	No appl.	No appl.	—	—

21 g. For purposes of interpreting Table 1:

22 i. Nitrogen agronomic rate limitation shall apply to both the
 23 winter and summer crop, unless follow-up soil nitrogen measurements fall into a

1 lower category, or crop tissue (basal stem and leaf sampling) measurements show a
2 deficiency in the crop tissue for nitrogen.

3 ii. For crop year 2025 and thereafter, winter manure
4 applications will be split into a fall and early spring application as indicated in Table
5 1 for fields to which manure is applied by irrigation.

6 iii. If a given Application Field exceeds 25 mg N/kg for three
7 (3) years in a row after crop year 2025, then Defendants shall reduce the application
8 limit for that field from 75% to 50% until the nitrogen level drops below 15 mg
9 N/kg.

10 iv. If a given Application Field exceeds 35 mg N/kg for two
11 (2) years in a row after crop year 2025, then Defendants shall apply no manure to
12 that field until the nitrogen level drops below 15 mg N/kg.

13 h. Nitrogen levels used to determine compliance with Table 1 shall
14 be measured by the average of nitrate-nitrogen plus ammonium-nitrogen in each of
15 the top two feet of the soil column based on Fall post-harvest sampling results.

16 i. Agronomic rate adjustments shown in Table 1 shall be applied
17 after completing the standard agronomic rate calculation. For example, if a standard
18 agronomic rate calculation indicates a need for 2.0 million gallons of manure, and if
19 the restricted rate in Table 1 is “90 percent of agronomic rate”, then the maximum
20 manure application for that Application Field will be 1.8 million gallons (2.0 million
21
22
23

1 gallons x 90% = 1.8 million gallons).

2 j. For the Application Fields to which Defendants apply manure via
3 irrigation or blending, Defendants shall split the winter manure application into a
4 fall and early spring application. The amount of the split shall be adjusted based on
5 Fall residual soil nitrogen level as indicated in Table 1 for crop year 2025 and
6 beyond.

7 31. With respect to phosphorus, Defendants shall adhere to the following
8 beginning on the Effective Date:

9 a. Defendants shall measure available phosphorus at the 0-1-foot
10 and 1-2-foot levels in its Application Fields in parallel with fall soil nitrogen testing.

11 b. Defendants shall maintain their Application Fields in the low-
12 risk category as measured using the current NRCS approved phosphorus index
13 procedures.

14 c. Defendants shall maintain phosphorus levels in its feed ration at
15 a level less than 0.4% phosphorus measured on a total ration dry matter basis.

16 d. Defendants shall continue physical manure solids separation for
17 enhanced solids recovery, as well as composting and exports to reduce on-Dairy
18 applications of manure and wastewater.

19 32. With respect to phosphorus, in addition to the requirements in
20 Paragraph 31 above, and beginning in the crop season that commences after
21

1 Defendants' Fall 2026 post-harvest sampling, Defendants shall restrict their manure
 2 application in the manner described in the following Table 2:

3

4 **Table 2. Manure Application Restrictions for Phosphorus Control**

Fall Average Available P in Upper 2 feet (mg Olsen P/kg)	Total annual application based on P (Crop Year 2027+)
< 40 mg P/kg	Control for N
41-100 mg P/kg	90% of crop extraction
101-180 mg P/kg	80% of crop extraction
181-300 mg P/kg	25% of crop extraction
> 300 mg P/kg	No application

5

6 a. Defendants shall apply the requirements in Table 2 to each of
 7 their Application Fields based on the average fall post-harvest measurements of
 8 available phosphorus measured in the top 2 feet of the soil column in each
 9 Application Field.

10

11 b. Defendants shall adhere to the requirements in Table 2 during the
 12 crop year following the Fall compliance measurements or until resampling has
 13 shown that the requirements in Table 2 are no longer required (e.g., an Application
 14 Field measuring 45 ppm P in fall is retested in spring and measures 38 ppm P).

15

16 c. Based on the Fall available phosphorus measurements, the
 17 requirements in Table 2 shall be implemented and followed for the duration of the
 18 Consent Decree.

19

20 d. For purposes of Table 2, phosphorus extraction rate limitation

1 shall apply to the full crop year, unless follow-up soil available phosphorus
2 measurements fall into a lower category.

3 e. The annual limits on phosphorus application listed in Table 2 are
4 expressed as a function of the estimated annual phosphorus extraction rate of the
5 crops (extraction rate = tons crop/acre x P content/ton crop) grown on each field
6 during the crop year. The annual application amount will be based on the fall
7 available P levels and will be split in most cases into multiple applications, with the
8 total annual amount applied limited to the Table 2 values.

9
10 33. Defendants shall implement a soil moisture monitoring program at the
11 Application Fields in accordance with the following requirements:

12 a. For purposes of this paragraph, a “Soil Moisture Monitoring
13 Period” begins two weeks prior to Defendants’ first irrigation or manure application
14 event in each Application Field through at least two weeks after Defendants’ final
15 irrigation or manure application event in each field. During most years, the Soil
16 Moisture Monitoring Period will extend from mid-March through early November.
17

18 b. During the Soil Moisture Monitoring Periods in 2023, 2024 and
19 2025 (the “Three Year Test Period”), Defendants shall install and operate a set of
21 irrigation sensors to monitor soil moisture levels in eight (8) representative
22 Application Fields as illustrated in Exhibits 5a-b. For Application Fields that contain
23 soils with significantly different nitrate leaching potential or water holding capacity,

1 as indicated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (“NRCS”), Defendants
2 shall deploy and operate soil moisture sensors in each of two representative soil
3 series. The locations of the soil moisture sensors are shown on the maps attached
4 hereto as Exhibit 6.

5 c. Defendants shall install sensors in each location at the following
6 three approximate depths (variable by +/- two inches): 0.5-foot, 1.5-feet and 2.5-
7 feet. If rocky or indurated soil properties in any location preclude effective
8 placement of the 2.5-foot sensor after three independent boring attempts, Defendants
9 shall not be required to install the 2.5-foot sensor in that location(s), but shall
10 document for each of those location(s) the total depth of soil to the point of boring
11 refusal.

12 d. To verify field capacity estimates, Defendants shall calibrate
13 sensors at the time of installation using a gravimetric sample approach where soil
14 water is measured on a weight basis. Soil bulk density measurements used in
15 calibration shall be confirmed for each sensor location at each depth. Calibration
16 shall be reported in the first Annual Report (described in Paragraph 33(h)) along
17 with Application Field capacity estimates for each monitoring location at each depth.

18 e. Defendants shall calibrate any replacement sensors in a similar
19 manner as in Paragraph 33(d), and these calibrations shall be reported in the Annual
20 Report (described in Paragraph 33(h)) for the year in which the sensors were

1 replaced. Defendants shall have at least two (2) replacement sensors available at the
2 Dairy in case of failure of installed sensors.

3 f. Defendants shall use best efforts to maintain the sensors in an
4 operational condition throughout the Soil Moisture Monitoring Period. Defendants
5 shall implement necessary maintenance, repairs or replacement of the sensors with
6 the goal of minimizing operational down-times to twenty-one (21) days for the two
7 shallowest depths and fifteen (15) days for the sensors at 2.5 feet.

8 g. During the Three-Year Test Period, Defendants shall use the soil
9 moisture sensors to validate and, if necessary, adjust its irrigation rates to meet crop
10 needs while minimizing exceedances of Application Field capacity in the 2.5-feet
11 soil level as follows:

12 i. Defendants shall obtain weekly irrigation needs estimates
13 from an agronomist using the Evapotranspiration method.

14 ii. Defendants shall irrigate their Application Fields
15 consistent with the recommended values unless soil moisture sensors indicate an
16 exceedance of field capacity at the 2.5-feet level.

17 iii. If soil sensors from the prior week indicate exceedances of
18 Application Field capacity at the 2.5-feet level, Defendants shall adjust the
19 recommendation for future irrigation rates downward from what would otherwise be
20 provided using the Evapotranspiration method, with the goal of decreasing and
21

1 maintaining soil moisture levels below field capacity at the 2.5 feet level. Defendants
2 shall track both the original and any adjusted recommendations on a weekly basis
3 throughout the Three-Year Test Period.

4 iv. For the first two fields with an irrigation-related
5 exceedance of Application Field capacity at the 2.5 feet level during the Three-Year
6 Test Period, Defendants' Fall soil monitoring shall include a one-time sampling on
7 each such Application Field that shall extend to the 5-feet depth in that Application
8 Field (or to the depth of refusal). For each sample, Defendants shall analyze at 3
9 feet, 4 feet, and 5 feet for ammonia-N and nitrate-N and Olsen P. The resulting
10 sampling data shall be provided to Plaintiffs consistent with the Notice provisions.
11

12 h. No later than February 28 in the year after the end of each Soil
13 Moisture Monitoring Period during the Three-Year Test Period (i.e., for the 2023
14 Soil Moisture Monitoring Period, this date would fall on February 28, 2024),
15 Defendants shall provide Plaintiffs pursuant to the Notice provisions in Paragraph
16 62 with an Annual Report containing Defendants' initial and adjusted weekly
17 recommendations and the monitoring data for each soil moisture sensor in tabular
18 format. Monitoring data provided for each sensor location shall consist of a complete
19 digital file (.xlsx, .xls, or .csv) and a graphical readout showing measured moisture
20 levels for the 0.5-foot, 1.5-feet and 2.5-feet sensors throughout each Soil Moisture
21 Monitoring Period, with notes summarizing any encountered sensor performance
22
23

1 issues, any completed repairs, and notes documenting the dates, amounts, and rates
2 (gallons/acre) of irrigation water and manure applications in the Application Field
3 where the sensor is located. Defendants shall also provide in the Annual Report
4 local daily precipitation data for the year using publicly-available weather data from
5 the nearest reliable weather station.

6
7 i. If during the 2025 Soil Moisture Monitoring Period the moisture
8 sensor readings show a pattern of ongoing irrigation-related exceedances of field
9 capacity at the 2.5-feet depth (i.e., three or more exceedances, not counting
10 exceedances immediately following precipitation events), then Defendants shall
11 maintain moisture sensors in the Application Field where such sensor exceedances
12 were reported until no more than one (1) exceedance is recorded in that field during
13 the Soil Moisture Monitoring Period.

14
15 34. Beginning on the Effective Date, Defendants shall for the duration of
16 this Decree maintain application records of (a) any manure it hauls to and applies to
17 an Application Field; and (b) any manure it applies to Application Fields through
18 irrigation or blending. Such records shall include the Application Field ID; the
19 manure quantity (volume); characteristics (blended or straight); date of application;
20 and a link to the manure nutrient testing information. Defendants shall keep separate
21 application records in the event they conduct multiple applications on different days.

22
23 35. No later than January 31 of each year beginning in 2024 and for each

1 year for the duration of the Consent Decree, Defendants shall provide to Plaintiffs
2 PDF copies of manure management records for the prior crop year via electronic
3 mail (at the addresses listed in Paragraph 62). Records that Defendants shall provide
4 pursuant to this paragraph are listed in Exhibit 7.
5

6 36. Any manure management records routinely generated by Defendants in
7 compliance with its CAFO permit and similar regulatory requirements shall be kept
8 on-site at the Dairy for five (5) years from the date of generation. No more than once
9 per calendar year, Plaintiffs shall have the right to request access to conduct an on-
10 site review of the manure management records for which they have not been
11 provided copies pursuant to Paragraph 35.
12

13 37. Defendants shall use flow meters on all Application Fields to which
14 they apply lagoon water through irrigation or blending.
15

UNDERGROUND CONVEYANCE INSPECTION

16 38. No later than December 31, 2024, DBD shall inspect the wastewater
17 and manure lines being utilized between the sump, settling basins, milking parlors
18 and the lagoons at the Dairies as attached hereto as Exhibit 8. If the inspection shows
19 that repairs need to be made in any of those lines, Defendants shall make the
20 necessary repairs, which could include cutting and permanently capping such lines,
21 no later than December 31, 2024.
22

23 39. Inspection and any required repair work shall be performed by an

1 experienced and qualified contractor.

40. For gravity draining lines, the following equipment shall be used:

- Lines 6-inch or greater – jet and “crawler” camera
 - Lines less than 6-inch – use a push camera.

41. Once inspection and any required repairs are completed, Defendants shall submit to Plaintiffs a written description of the activities Defendants undertook pursuant to Paras. 41-43, which shall include documentation of the lines inspected and the exact location(s) of any repair(s) made.

SILAGE AREA

42. DBD shall store all silage harvested in 2023 or after on asphalt or concrete pads at all times throughout the duration of the Consent Decree. DBD shall ensure that the silage pads are sloped to drain to a lined collection sump.

SITE DRAINAGE

43. DBD agrees to complete a Stormwater budget and Site Drainage Plan for SMD, the Nichols and Van Belle containment pens, and the Heifer Ranch facilities by no later than 6/30/24, and shall complete the site drainage improvements no later than 6/30/25, which shall include at least one lined lagoon at the heifer ranch to capture all site runoff.

44. DBD shall provide to Plaintiffs copies of the site improvement plans for each facility within fifteen (15) days of completion. Plaintiffs shall have forty-

1 five (45) days to review and provide comments on the drainage plans. DBD shall
2 incorporate Plaintiffs reasonable comments into the improvement plans. Any
3 disagreements shall be subject to the Paragraph 59 Dispute Resolution process.
4

COMPOST AREAS

5
6 45. Defendants shall compost manure only on the compost area (the
7 “Area”), attached hereto as Exhibit 9.

8 46. No later than December 31, 2023, DBD shall complete the following
9 elements:

- 10 a) Survey the Area topography to 1-foot vertical contours.
11 b) Design a grading plan to provide and maintain a two (2) percent
12 average slope for drainage over the Area with no negative slopes
13 measured on a 10-foot distance and route stormwater and other
14 liquids to specific collection locations such as ditches, swales,
15 and/or sumps. The Parties acknowledge and agree that
16 maintenance of windrows and normal operations may over time
17 impact the slope in isolated points. Defendants nevertheless
18 commit to the normal and customary maintenance of such area,
19 and to timely identify and eliminate, as weather and conditions
20 allow, any instances where the slope is lost and water is allowed
21 to pond.
22
23

1 c) Collect five (5) bulk samples of soil from random
2 locations within the Area for laboratory analysis. Samples will be
3 collected from the 0- to 12-inch depth interval below the final
4 grade surface based on the grading plan. Final grade, and samples,
5 shall be of native soils only.

6
7 d) Samples will be analyzed for: (1) particle size by ASTM D6913 –
8 *Standard Test Methods for Particle-Size Distribution (Gradation)*
9 *of Soils Using Sieve Analysis* and ASTM D 7928 – *Standard Test*
10 *Method for Particle-Size Distribution (Gradation) of Fine-*
11 *Grained Soils Using the Sedimentation (Hydrometer) Analysis*
12 and; (2) compaction characteristics (“Proctor”) by ASTM D1557
13 – *Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Compaction*
14 *Characteristics of Soil Using Modified Effort (56,000 ft-lbf/ft³*
15 *(2,700 kN-m/m³)).*

16
17 e) Following analysis, the five samples will be remolded and
18 compacted to 95 percent of standard Proctor; the remolded
19 samples will be analyzed for hydraulic conductivity by ASTM
20 D5084 – *Standard Test Methods for Measurement of Hydraulic*
21 *Conductivity of Saturated Porous Materials Using a Flexible Wall*
22 *Permeameter* to determine if the soils achieve a permeability of

1 less than 1×10^{-4} cm/s at 95 percent compaction.

2 47. Prior to December 31, 2024, the Area will be graded according to plan
3 and compacted to meet specifications.

4 48. During compaction, soils will be tested in-place by ASTM D6938 –
5 Standard Test Method for In-Place Density and Water Content of Soil and Soil-
6 Aggregate by Nuclear Methods (Shallow Depth) at a frequency of one (1) test per
7 25,000 sq. ft. of area to verify 95 percent compaction.

8 49. Verification of a two percent average grade will be based on completion
9 of post-grading survey at one-foot contour level.

10 50. Following grading, lined or asphalt concrete collection ditches or strip
11 drains, and lined or concrete collection sumps, will be installed at approximately the
12 locations depicted in Exhibit 10. (The lining details in Exhibit 10 are in reference
13 only to the trenches, and not to the lagoons.)

14 51. Once completed, DBD shall submit to Plaintiffs a written description
15 prepared by a Washington State licensed professional engineer of the activities DBD
16 undertook with respect to this work. The Licensed engineer shall certify and stamp
17 that the site meets slope and compaction requirements of this agreement.

18
19
20
CLEAN DRINKING WATER PROJECT

21 52. The purpose of the Clean Drinking Water Project (“CDWP”) payment
22 is to provide alternative clean drinking water to residents in the area near the Dairies.

1 All aspects of the program shall be managed by the CDWP; the Dairies' only
2 obligation is to provide the agreed-upon funding. Should anyone contact the Dairies
3 regarding alternative water supplies they shall be redirected to the CDWP, who will
4 bear the sole responsibility for any such alternative supplies (except for properties
5 owned by the Dairies, in which case the Dairies shall be solely responsible).
6

7 53. Defendants shall make a one-time payment of \$25,000 to CDWP within thirty
8 (30) days of entry of this Decree.

9 **ATTORNEYS' AND EXPERT WITNESS FEES AND COSTS**

10 54. Plaintiffs shall be considered the prevailing party for purposes of settlement.
11 DBD shall wire Plaintiffs \$250,000 to the Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.,
12 941 Lawrence St., Eugene, Oregon 97401, ATTN: Charles Tebbutt, within seven (7)
13 days of entry of this decree; provided Tebbutt has provided copies of billing records
14 sufficient to establish fees and expenses of at least that amount. Within sixty (60)
15 days of entry of this consent decree, at DBD's option, it may either pay Tebbutt the
16 remaining sum owed consistent with the billing records heretofore provided and
17 thereby resolve all costs and fees that could have been sought by Plaintiffs; or
18 alternatively, DBD may demand that Plaintiffs file a motion for an award of
19 attorneys' fees, expert witnesses' fees and costs incurred in this litigation. The Dairies
20 shall have the right to respond to Plaintiffs' submission in the ordinary course and as
21 per the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's local rules. Any award of
22
23

1 fees and costs to the Plaintiffs shall be reduced by the \$350,000 in payments already
 2 made by the Defendants with the balance due within thirty (30) days of the Court's
 3 order.

4 55. DBD shall, in addition to payments made pursuant to Paragraph 54 above,
 5 pay Plaintiffs to monitor implementation of this Decree ("Monitoring Costs") as
 6 indicated in the following Table 3:

7 **Table 3. Monitoring Costs**

Date	Amount DBD Shall Pay to Plaintiffs
Within seven (7) days of entry of this Decree, for the remainder of 2023	\$30,000
1/01/2024	\$40,000
1/01/2025	\$40,000
1/01/2026	\$30,000
1/1/2027	\$30,000
1/1/2028	\$15,000
By 1/1 each year thereafter if termination has not occurred	\$2,000

19 56. Such Monitoring Costs do not include work performed by Plaintiffs' experts
 20 with regard to the Remediation Investigation and the oxygenation Pilot Project, or
 21 implementation thereof. Defendants shall fund \$300,000 in an escrow account for
 22 payment of Plaintiffs' RI and oxygenation Pilot Project within ten (10) days of
 23

1 approval of the work by Department of Ecology. The escrow funds shall be paid to
2 and managed by the Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt. Payments for services shall
3 be made from the escrow account within thirty (30) days of receipt of invoices unless
4 Defendants object in writing to specific payment concerns. Any disputes shall be
5 resolved through the Dispute Resolution process set forth in Paragraph 59. By
6 January 15 of each year commencing in 2025, the Parties shall confer to determine
7 whether additional escrow payments, and the amount thereof, shall be deposited until
8 implementation of the Pilot Project decisions are complete. If the Parties cannot
9 agree, the matter shall be submitted to Dispute Resolution per Paragraph 59.

11 57. The Parties shall use best efforts to minimize Plaintiffs' Monitoring Costs.
12 For instance, the Parties shall maintain open communication with each other; DBD
13 shall provide required documentation in a timely manner to Plaintiffs; and Plaintiffs
14 shall attempt to bundle activities and associated site visits where possible.

16 **TERMINATION**

17 58. This Consent Decree and all obligations set forth herein shall terminate on
18 December 31, 2028, if all determinative wells meet the requirements, and except for
19 those obligations specifically noted herein to terminate at other times, including
20 obligations based on construction schedules defined herein. Termination may occur
21 earlier than 2027 if the determinative wells from all remediated areas show
22 groundwater at less than 10 mg/l for nitrate (including ammonia) and 1 mg/L nitrite.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

59. In the event of any dispute regarding implementation, interpretation, or compliance with this Consent Decree, the Parties shall first attempt to informally resolve the dispute through meetings of the Parties. Any Party to this Consent Decree may initiate the informal dispute resolution process by serving, through its counsel, written notice of a request for a dispute resolution on the other Party's counsel. The Parties will attempt to have the Court appoint an arbitrator to resolve disputes that may arise as part of the implementation of this Consent Decree. Any costs of the arbitrator shall be borne by Defendants. If an arbitrator is agreed upon, then the Parties may each submit their respective positions to the arbitrator within thirty (30) days of a writing by either side that the Parties were unable to reach a resolution among themselves or as otherwise instructed by the arbitrator. If no arbitrator is agreed upon, and resolution is of a dispute is not reached within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of that notice of a request for dispute resolution is served, then the Parties may resolve the dispute by filing motions with the Court.

EFFECTIVE DATE

60. The effective date of this Consent Decree shall be the date upon which the Court enters in the civil docket a copy of this Consent Decree signed by the Court.

FINAL JUDGMENT

61. Upon approval and entry of this Consent Decree by the Court, this

1 Consent Decree shall constitute a final, non-appealable judgment of the Court under
2 Rules 54 and 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

3 **NOTICES**
4

5 62. Whenever notice is required to be given or a document is required to be
6 sent by one party to another under the terms of this Consent Decree, it shall be
7 directed to the individuals at the addresses specified below, unless prior notice of a
8 change has been given to the other Party. Notice under this Consent Decree shall be
9 effective on the date of service through electronic mail.

10 For Plaintiffs: Charles M. Tebbutt, charlie@tebbuttlaw.com
11

12 Jon Frohnmayer, jon@tebbuttlaw.com
13

14 Daniel C. Snyder, dsnyder@publicjustice.net
15

16 For DBD: Jay Carroll, jcarroll@hnw.law
17

18 Scott Stephen, scott.stephen@agrimgt.com
19

20 John Glessner, jwglessner@aol.com
21 Drboffice@embarqmail.com
22 Drboffice2@embarqmail.com
23

24 Any Party may change either the notice recipient or the address for providing
25 notice to it by serving the other Parties with a notice setting forth such new notice
26 recipient or address.
27

28 ///

1 ///
2
3

WE HEREBY CONSENT to the Entry of this Consent Decree.

Community Association for Restoration of the Environment, Inc.

By: _____

Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

Friends of Toppenish Creek, Inc.

By: _____

Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

Center for Food Safety, Inc.

By: _____

Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

17 *Plaintiffs*
18
19

DBD Washington, LLC

By: _____

Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

1 **SMD, LLC**

2 By: _____

3 Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

4 **AUSTIN JACK DECOSTER**

5 By: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

6 **DECOSTER ENTERPRISES, INC.**

7 By: _____

8 Name: signature appearing at ECF No. 180

9
10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 20th DAY OF June 2023.



A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Thomas O. Rice".

12
13 THOMAS O. RICE
14 United States District Judge
15
16

17 Respectfully submitted this 9th day of June, 2023.

18 /s/ Charles M. Tebbutt

19 Charles M. Tebbutt, WSBA #47255

20 Jon Frohnmayer, *pro hac vice*

21 Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.

22 941 Lawrence St.

23 Eugene, OR 97401

charlie@tebbuttlaw.com

jon@tebbuttlaw.com

Tel: (541) 344-3505

Fax: (541) 344-3516

1 /s/ Daniel C. Snyder
2 Daniel C. Snyder, *pro hac vice*
3 PUBLIC JUSTICE
4 1620 L Street NW, Suite 630
5 Washington, DC 20036
6 Tel: (202) 861-5251
7 dsnyder@publicjustice.net
8 /s/ Andrea K. Rodgers
9 Andrea K. Rodgers, WSBA #38683
10 Law Offices of Andrea K. Rodgers
11 3026 NW Esplanade
12 Seattle, WA 98117
13 andrearodgers42@gmail.com
14 Tel: (206) 696-2851

15 /s/ Andrea K. Rodgers
16 ANDREA K. RODGERS
17 WSBA #38683
18 Law Offices of Andrea K. Rodgers
19 3026 NW Esplanade
20 Seattle, WA 98117
21 andrearodgers42@gmail.com
22 Tel: (206) 696-2851

23 /s/ Toby J. Marshall
24 Toby J. Marshall, WSBA #32726
25 Blythe H. Chandler, WSBA #43387
26 Terrell Marshall Law Group PLLC
27 936 North 34th Street, Suite 300
28 Seattle, Washington 98103-8869
29 tmarshall@terrellmarshall.com
30 bchandler@terrellmarshall.com
31 Tel: (206) 816-6603

32 /s/ Amy van Saun
33 AMY VAN SAUN, *pro hac vice*
34 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY
35 303 Sacramento Street, 2nd Floor
36 San Francisco, CA 94111
37 avansaun@centerforfoodsafety.org

1 Tel: (415) 826-2770

2 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

3 /s/ Gary H. Baise

4 Gary H. Baise, pro hac vice

5 D.C. Bar ID #194878

6 2201 Great Falls Street

7 Falls Church, VA 22043

Tel: 202-320-6336

Fax: 703-534-1753 vthedgerow@aol.com

8 /s/ J. Jay Carroll

9 J. Jay Carroll

10 WSBA No. 17424

11 HALVERSON | NORTHWEST LAW

12 GROUP P.C.

13 405 East Lincoln Avenue

14 P.O. Box 22550

15 Yakima, Washington 98907

16 Tel: (509) 248-6030

17 Fax: (509) 453-6880

18 jcarroll@hnw.law

19 *Counsel for Austin Jack DeCoster and DBD, et al.*

20

21

22

23